

REMARKS

In Paper No. 14, mailed July 8, 2003, the Examiner indicated that he would issue a restriction requirement with respect to the claims submitted in this amendment. The Examiner stated that claims 124-136 and 172-182 are drawn to a driver circuit, whereas claims 137-171 are drawn to a transceiver/receiver. The Examiner further stated that these two groups of claims are classified in different classes and subclasses.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that one set of claims is directed to a driver circuit or signal driving methodology, while the other set of claims is directed to transceivers/receivers and related methodologies. The applicant also agrees that driver circuits may be assigned to a different class than transceiver/receiver circuits. Nevertheless, all the newly submitted independent claims utilize similar underlying methodologies and concepts. Under a "unity of invention" analysis, all these claims would be classified as a single invention, because all relate to systems, devices or circuits that can transmit and/or receive data over a data path using both N-PAM and M-PAM (e.g., 2-PAM and 4-PAM) signaling. Therefore, in reality, the prior art applicable to claims 124-136 and 172-182 will also be applicable to claims 137-171, and vice versa, even if the two groups of claims are in other respects distinct.

Applicants respectfully request substantive examination of claims 124-182.

Date: August 27, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Gary S. Williams

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP

3300 Hillview Avenue

Palo Alto, California 94304

(650) 493-4935

31,066

(Reg. No.)